may bring to their authors, are open to the reproach that they encourage idleness and imposition as often as they confer needed assistance. Nothing that we devise can do away with the old-fashioned duty of personally calling upon the poor. There are some among our poorer neighbors who care more for a loving word than they do for a dollar.

FRATERNAL SOCIETIES' LIFE ASSURANCE.

The number of fraternal associations offering their members gratuities, or endowments, or sick benefits, is surprisingly large. We showed only the other day that there were in Ontario, according to the Provincial Registrar of Friendly Societies, no fewer than 60 or 70 in Ontario, with between 200,000 and 300,000 members, and with yearly receipts of $2,450,000. This journal has repeatedly dwelt upon the need of intelligent prudence in the management of such bodies in order to the levying of charges sufficient to make good their promises to their members, and the proper husbanding of their resources to that end. It is pleasing to find an awakening on the subject among members and managers of fraternal societies in Canada.

In February last a committee of the Canadian Fraternal Association, appointed to consider the question of adequate rates for the purpose of furnishing life assurance to members, made its report. This committee was composed of Messrs. A. J. Pattison, of the Canadian Home Circles; W. Williams, of the Ancient Order of Foresters, and W. W. Buchanan, of the Royal Templars of Temperance. These gentlemen examined the data compiled by English actuaries from the experience of associations such as the Manchester Unity and the Ancient Foresters, as well as records of the experience of American and Canadian benefit societies. And we find the frank statement made on the first page of their report—a statement which deserves to command the attention of every manager of such associations—that: "The results of our investigation point conclusively to the necessity for a re-arrangement of the rates charged by the beneficiary societies in order to secure permanence and }stability in their work."

They give a series of tables prepared by different authorities. First, that of Mr. Neison, compiled from the experience of the English Foresters for over a hundred years. In the Natural Premium Table, the net monthly rate needed for death benefit of $1,000 (expenses not included), requires per member, as under, increasing each year with age:

$0.60	per month	at age	18
0.62	"	"	25
0.67	"	"	30
1.01	"	"	40
1.56	"	"	50
2.81	"	"	60

In Neison's Level Premium Table. 4 per cent., without secession, payment remaining stationary as at age of entry, the following is the net monthly rate for $1,000 (expenses not included):

$1.12	per month	at age	18
1.36	"	"	25
1.60	"	"	30
2.28	"	"	40
3.43	"	"	50
5.45	"	"	60

The report made by Mr. L. G. Fouse, actuary, to the American assessment companies, contains a table giving to members the benefit of lapse as reported by Meech and others. Mr. Fouse's table recommends the following rates per month per $1,000 benefit (not including expenses):

$0 87	per month	at age	20
0.99	"	"	25
1.14	"	"	30
1.59	"	"	40
2.39	"	"	50
3.85	"	"	60

In the above table Fouse bases his computation upon age 40, but states that to be strictly accurate a calculation should be made for each age. One reason for the difference between the rates of the two last tables is manifestly the fact that Fouse allows for lapses while Neison does not.

Messrs. Pattison, Williams, and Buchanan having gone over these reports, decided to recommend for the consideration of the Canadian Fraternal Association a table of rates slightly lower than that of Fouse. Thus: Monthly payment for $1,000 insurance, payable at death (expenses not included):

$0.75	per	month	at age	18
0.79	"	"	"	20
0.91	"	"	"	25
1.07	"	"	"	30
1.52	"	"	"	40
2.29	"	"	"	50
3.63	"	"	"	60

In arriving at these figures a lapse experience of 33 per cent. was estimated. The committee say that they "have approached the subject of the adequacy or the inadequacy of rates of payment with considerable hesitation," and we do not wonder at it. In system, hardly any two societies are alike. Some societies promise their members one thing and some another. Some collect a regular amount monthly, and others levy assessments as the need arises. However, the committee's study of the subject has resulted in good, for they are compelled to say that the following principles seem to them essential to the permanence and stability of Friendly Benevolent Societies paying life insurance benefits:

(A) Regular monthly payments, irrespective of death losses.

(B) Graded rates, according to age at entry.

(C) An equation or reserve fund, to meet increasing cost of membership with increasing age, or,

(D) A rate, increasing each year of membership.

We observe that after considering the rates, this committee has "discarded those raising monthly as likely to be unsatisfactory to the members." If, however, they add, the association is of the opinion that net natural rates are likely to be more acceptable than level payments, Mr. Neison's table given above will be found a safe one for adoption. The subject of endowment insurance by assessment societies is evidently found a troublesome one, for the conclusion of the portion of the report devoted to death rates reads: "Your committee have not had time at their disposal to enter into the question of 'Endowment Insurance,' from a friendly society standpoint."

THE I. O. FORESTERS.

The unsoundness of the position taken by the management of this body in respect of life assurance is being recognized abroad as well as in Canada. A copy of an English newspaper, the *Newark Herald*, is sent us. It contains a letter from a Nottingham correspondent, John Rodger, which recognizes the weak points of the I. O. F. scheme, and calls it "this great delusion of half-price insurance." Having heard Lieut.-Col. Paterson's exposition in England of the beauties and advantages of the Order, whose great salvation, the Col. said, is the anticipated lapse record, this gentleman is moved to exclaim: "What a future to contemplate, for men who are actuated by 'LOVE, BROTHERHOOD and CHARITY.' And what a wall of sand to build a tower of strength upon." We quote a portion of this letter:

"Seeing that at the age of 30 it would require the investment at 4 per cent. compound interest of the entire premium contributions—without any deduction for subsidiary benefits, earlier death, or expenses—to realize £100 at the age of 70; and that at the age of 40 it would require a similar investment of the entire premium contributions at 5⅜ per cent. compound interest to realize £100 at 70, do the officials mean to assure us that lapses will cover the yawning gulf which will arise in the funds through early deaths, disablement benefits and consequent curtailment of revenue? No medical selection will make assurers of 30 and 40 live to 70 on the average; and the lapses, however numerous they may be, will not cover this deficiency, seeing the rates charged are little beyond the bare cost of "short term" assurances for one year.

"It is misleading the public to put forward as a standard basis of cost, for insurance pure and simple, figures purporting to be those of the Seventeen Offices Combined Experience Tables, seeing these figures are not the rates given in the Combined Experience Table for ordinary whole-of-life assurance. According to this table, which was prepared by a committee of actuaries and published in 1843, the level annual premium, calculated at 3 per cent. interest, for an assurance of £400 [$2,000] effected at age 30, payable at death, *and exclusive of any loading for expenses and profits*, would be £7 12s. 5d, for age 40, £10 8s. 5d., and for age 49, £14 14s. 3d.; whereas in the publications of the Order the table is said to show only a cost respectively of £3 9s. 3d., £4 5s. 2d., and £6 3s. 10d. The plain inference is, that what they pretend is the regular cost of ordinary life assurance is simply the cost of 'term' assurance *for one year*, with some small addition."

The correspondent is shrewd enough to perceive the confusion of term assurance with whole life rates which is put forward. And he declares, pertinently enough, that if the Order is attempting to do level premium whole-life business at term rates it does not require much actuarial science to realize that a terrible gap in the funds will occur soon. Evidently Mr. Paterson has not gulled *all* the Englishmen in Lincoln, Notts and Derby, for here is one who declares that "The Order cannot live on credit, plus an income equal to a third of its obligations, any more than a trading firm or private adventurer can. It is too late in the world's history for this operation to succeed."

A letter from EQUITY in to-day's issue tabulates, and thereby renders more effective, the convincing figures in the letter of